DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 365 HE 000 068

By-Hussain, K M. Leestamper, Robert
Survey on Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness at New Mexico State University.
New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces.
Pub Date Jun 68
Note-53p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.75
Descriptors-Administrator Attitudes, Community Responsibility, *Effective Teaching, *Evaluation, *Faculty, *Higher Education, Research Criteria, *Teaching
Identifiers-Las Cruces, New Mexico State University

In a questionnaire survey designed at the University of Toledo to determine the ranking of criteria of effective teaching, faculty, students and alumni at New Mexico State University agreed that "being well prepared for class" was the most important criterion. This ranking was upheld by 10 subgroups of faculty (faculty by years of service, teaching or administrative, and faculty by colleges), except for the College of Education which ranked "motivating students to do their best" as the most important criterion. The 3 groups all gave low rankings to research-related criteria and criteria concerned with off-campus community relations. The criterion of "making appearances which assist programs of community organization" was ranked as LEAST important. When criteria used in the faculty merit rating was compared to criteria used in the questionnaire, it was found that 4 criteria ranked in the top 10 in the survey do not appear in the Merit Rating Form, whereas 4 listed in the bottom 10 of the survey do, suggesting that the Form should be redesigned. The same pattern of discrepancy and implied need for change was evident when the questionnaire was compared with the University's most widely used student evaluation form. Patterns of rankings suggest that teaching faculty are being evaluated according to a different scale by administrative faculty. Rankings by subgroups of faculty, student and alumni indicate interesting divergencies. In identifying attitudes concerning teacher effectiveness, this study should provide a basis for discussion by administrators and faculty on how to devise more equitable and satisfactory evaluation procedures. (JS)

SURVEY ON CRITERIA OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AT NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BY
K.M. Hussain
Robert Leestamper

ED023365

HE 000 068

New Mexico State University
June, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction

2. Research Design

   2.1 Questionnaire Design

   2.2 Sample Design

   2.3 Computation

3. Presentation of Findings

   3.1 Tables Presented

   3.2 Symbols Used

4. Findings of Study

   4.1 Correlations

   4.2 Tables

5. Summary and Conclusions

6. Acknowledgement

APPENDICES

1. Questionnaire

B. Student Evaluation Form

List of Tables (Abbreviated tables)

These tables show the rankings of teaching criteria by different subgroups.

Table 1. Top ten criteria rankings.

Table 2. Selected criteria(lowest 50 for faculty)rankings.

Table 3. Criteria used in faculty evaluation.

Table 4. Top ten criteria ranked by administrative and non-administrative faculty.

Table 5. Top ten criteria ranked by faculty with varying yrs. of service at N.M.S.U.

Table 6. Top ten criteria ranked by students of varying grade point average.

Table 7. Top ten criteria ranked by various "types" of students.

Table 8. Top ten criteria ranked by faculty in each college.

Table 9. Top ten criteria ranked by students in different colleges.

Table 10. Top ten criteria ranked by alumni for each college.

Table 11. Top ten criteria ranked by College of Arts and Sciences.

Table 12. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Agric. and Home Economics.

Table 13. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Business Admin. & Economics.

Table 14. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Education.

Table 15. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Engineering.

Table 16. Ranking of top ten criteria by Graduate School.

16B. Summary of rank correlation coefficients displayed in tables 8a, 9a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a, 14a, 15a, 16a(between all N.M.S.U. and various subgroups in colleges) and sample sizes.

Table 17. Ranking of criteria used in student evaluation.

Note: There are tables with a suffix "A" for tables 2, and 4-16. These tables show the rank correlation coefficients for subgroups examined in the previous tables.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Fall 1967, New Mexico State University participated in a survey to determine the ranking of criteria of teaching effectiveness. Other institutions that participated in this survey were the Universities of Northern Illinois and Western Kentucky. The University of Toledo conceived and developed the original design and implemented the earlier phase of the study. This was done under the direction of Richard R. Perry, Director of Institutional Research, University of Toledo.

The research design of this survey is described below followed by the results.

There are plans to extend this survey to other institutions in the United States and Canada. The data for New Mexico State University survey will then be correlated with these other institutions. The results will be distributed to all those interested. It is expected that this phase of the study will be completed by early next year.

Since this report is rather long, some readers may wish to turn to the "Summary and Conclusions" chapter at the end of the report.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 Questionnaire Design

A questionnaire was designed by the Office of Institutional Studies at the University of Toledo. It was field-tested at Toledo and then used in the survey in which New Mexico State University participated.

2.2 Sample Design

This survey sampled three main groups in the university community: faculty(teaching and administrative), students, and alumni. Of the faculty, all were sent questionnaires. One hundred and eighty-six out of 387 responded(48%). From among the student body in the Fall of 1967, a random sample of 1,400 students were sent questionnaires, of which two hundred and eighty-three responded(20.2%). From the alumni, a random sample of 700 were sent questionnaires, of which one hundred and eighty-five responded(26.4%)

The number of responses by each subgroup of the population was examined for its adequacy. The responses of some subgroups were considered unrepresentative and hence excluded from the analysis. The graduate faculty is such a case. The poor response here resulted from an inadequate questionnaire design which did not allow faculty to indicate more than one college. Consequently, faculty that are not exclusively in the Graduate School did identify themselves with an undergraduate college and hence the response from the Graduate School in the sample was inadequate.

2.3 Computations

The questionnaire listed 60 criteria of teaching effectiveness. Each of the three groups of the university's community(faculty, students and alumni) were asked to indicate their judgement of the criteria as being "critical", "above average," "average," "below average," or of "no importance." These criteria were each given a weight of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. The sum of the product of the frequency of occurrence of a criteria and its weight gave a raw score total. This provided the basis of ranking of the criteria. Such rankings for various groups and subgroups were computed along with rank order correlation coefficients between various groups and subgroups. Most of this data is presented below.

In cases of ties between the raw scores, the ranking was averaged. For example, if three raw scores tied for ranks 6,7, and 8, then each was given a rank of seven. If two raw scores tied for the ranks one and two, then they were each ranked as 1.5.

3. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

3.1 Tables Presented

For the samples in each group (faculty, students, and alumni) the ranking is presented for all the criteria listed in the questionnaire. Also, the rank correlation coefficients for these three groups is presented. For subgroups (administrative and non-administrative faculty, faculty by years of service, students by grade point average, by location of home, by status of transference to N.M.S.U., and faculty, staff, and students by college), the ranking is shown for at least the top ten criteria as perceived by each of the three groups(faculty, students, and alumni). The ranking of the other criteria and the rank correlation coefficients for different combinations of subgroups are not presented in this study in order to save space.
is available and can be studied by persons interested.

Rank correlation coefficients are shown for all subgroups with all N.M.S.U.(faculty, students, and alumni). They have been rounded to three significant digits. The detailed computations have been made correct to six significant digits and are available to interested persons.

The questions as entered in the tables are sometime abbreviated in order to economize typing and space. For the detailed wording of the criteria in the questionnaire, see Appendix A.

The sum of subtotals do not always equal the totals in groups because some codes for subgroups are missing.

3.2 SYMBOLS USED

A&S. . . . . .College of Arts & Sciences

BA&E . . . . . .College of Bus. Admin. & Economics

AGRIC. . . . . .College of Agric. & Home Economics

EDUC . . . . . .College of Education

ENGR . . . . . .College of Engineering

GRAD . . . . . .Graduate School

GPA . . . . . .Grade Point Average

NMSU. . . . . .New Mexico State University

< less than -i.e.<2 means less than 2

> greater than-i.e.>3 means greater than 3

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

4.1 Correlations

The correlations between different groups and subgroups at New Mexico State University were all found to be significant at the 0.01 level .

The correlation between all the institutions surveyed (in both the original survey at the University of Toledo and the latter study in which New Mexico State University participated) was found to be well above the correlation required for significance. The rank correlation coefficients between the entire academic community(faculty, students, and alumni) of the four institutionsin the survey are as follows:

N. M. S. U. with University of Toledo =0.982

N.M. S. U. with Northern Illinois University =0.977

N. M. S. U. with Western Kentucky University =0.952

The rank correlation coefficient between the subgroups for each university are not shown here but the computations are available for interested persons.

Table 1

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI.

CRITERIA	Faculty	Students	Alumni	N.M.S.U.*
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Motivating students to do their best	3.0	13.0	11.0	11.0
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	4.0	12.0	4.0	5.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	5.0	7.0	10.0	7.0
Treating students with respect	6.0	11.0	7.0	10.0
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	7.0	8.0	9.0	9.0
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	8.0	2.0	6.0	3.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	9.0	4.0	5.0	6.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	10.0	5.5	3.0	4.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	11.0	5.5	8.0	8.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	12.0	9.5	13.0	12.0
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	21.0	9.5	12.0	13.0
Sample Size	186	283	185	654

*This includes all faculty, students, and alumni in the sample.

COMMENTS ON TABLE 1

1. There are only 13 criteria that are listed in the top ten most important criteria by at least one of the three groups.
2. The only criteria on which all three groups of faculty, student, and alumni agree is that of "being well prepared for class." This was ranked by all groups as the most important criteria of effective teaching.

TABLE 2

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED CRITERIA(LOWEST 50 FOR FACULTY) FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI.

CRITERIA	FACULTY	STUDENTS	ALUMNI	N.M.S.U.
Setting high standards of achievement for stud.	13.0	21.5	20.0	18.0
Raising the aspirational level of students	14.0	26.0	15.5	19.0
Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter	15.0	9.5	12.0	13.0
Rewriting and updating tests	15.0	15.0	15.5	15.0
Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom	16.5	20.0	19.0	17.0
Being readily avail. for consultation with stud.	16.5	14.0	14.0	14.0
Patiently assisting stud. with their problems	18.0	17.0	17.0	16.0
Accepting justified constructive criticism by qualified persons	19.0	21.5	23.0	22.0
Recognize the responsibility for the acad. success of students	20.0	19.0	25.0	21.0
Encouraging student participation in class	22.0	29.5	24.0	25.0
Iden. his comments which are personal opinion	23.0	29.5	31.0	28.0
Providing sev. test opportunities for students	24.0	25.0	34.0	27.0
Having practical experience in his field	25.0	16.0	18.0	20.0
Evidencing better than average speech qualities	26.0	23.0	29.0	26.0
Seldom using sarcasm with students	27.0	37.0	37.0	34.0
Encouraging moral responsibility in stud. by his ex.	28.0	38.0	30.0	32.0
Engaging in cont. formal study in his field	29.0	24.0	22.0	12.0
Making written comments on corrected returned assig.	30.0	18.0	21.0	22.5
Returning graded assignments promptly	31.0	32.0	26.0	30.0

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

CRITERIA	FACULTY	STUDENTS	ALUMNI	N.M.S.U.
Relating course material to that of other courses	32.0	33.0	28.0	31.0
Using more than 1 type of evaluation device	33.0	28.0	27.0	29.0
Making an effort to kno· stud. as individuals	34.0	40.0	39.0	36.0
Exhibiting a genuine sense of humor	35.0	41.0	47.0	42.0
Explaining grading standards	36.0	39.0	43.5	40.0
Displaying broad intellectual interests	37.0	42.0	38.0	41.0
Indication that the scope & demands of each assign. have been considered carefully	38.0	31.0	35.0	33.0
Exhibiting an intelligent personal phil. of life	39.0	49.0	43.5	46.0
Explaining grading procedures	40.0	34.0	41.5	37.0
Presenting organized supp. course material to stud.	41.0	45.0	36.0	43.0
Challenging students convictions	42.0	43.0	40.0	44.0
Demonstrating a stable level-headed personality	43.0	36.0	33.0	35.0
Earning the respect of his colleagues	44.0	47.0	41.5	45.0
Announcing tests and quizzes in advance	45.0	27.0	48.0	39.0
nspiring stud. to continue to graduate study	46.0	52.0	51.0	52.0
Taking measures to prevent cheating by students	47.0	35.0	32.0	38.0
Utilizing visual aids to assist in creating subj. matter achievement with students	48.0	48.0	46.0	47.0
Sharing departamental duties with his colleagues	48.0	50.0	52.0	50.0
Beginning and ending classes on time	50.0	46.0	49.0	48.0
Being neatly dressed	51.0	51.0	50.0	51.0

TABE 2 continued

CRITERIA	FACULTY	STUDENTS	ALUMNI	N.M.S.U.
Having irritating personal mannerisms	52.0	54.0	54.0	53.0
Holding membership in scholarly organization	53.0	57.0	55.0	55.0
Publishing material related to his subject field	54.0	59.0	58.0	57.0
Presenting an ext. lucid syl. of the course to stud.	55.0	44.0	45.0	3.0
Being consistently involved in research projects	56.0	55.0	57.0	56.0
Being knowledgeable about the community in which he lives	57.0	53.0	53.0	54.0
Devoting time to student activities on campus	58.0	58.0	59.0	59.0
Involving himself in appropriate univ. comm.	59.0	56.0	56.0	58.0
Making appearances which assist programs of community organizations	60.0	60.0	60.0	60.0

NOTES ON TABLE 2

1. Table 2 is a continuation of Table 1 and shows the ranking of criteria not included in Table 1.

COMMENTS ON TABLE 2

1. The criterion of "publishing material related to his subject" was ranked as 54, 59, and 58 of the most important (out of 60 criteria) by faculty, students, and alumni respectively.
2. The criterion of "making appearances which assist programs of community organizations" was ranked as the least important criteria of effective teaching by all three groups of faculty, students, and alumni.

RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR GROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 1 & 2.

Faculty with alumni =0.952

Faculty with students =0.935

Students with alumni =0.965

Faculty with all N.M.S.U* =0.972

Students with all N.M.S.U.* =0.985

Alumni with all N.M.S.U.* =0.986

*Includes all three groups in the sample-faculty, students and alumni.

TABLE 3

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING USED IN FACULTY EVALUATION* AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI.

		Faculty	Students	Alumni
Teaching				
Attitude toward student				
	Q. 19	46.0	52.0	51.0
	Q. 22	22.0	29.5	24.0
	Q. 33	18.0	17.0	17.0
	Q. 39	16.5	14.0	14.0
	Q. 47	4.0	12.0	4.0
	Q. 54	38.0	31.0	35.0
Knowledge of Subject matter				
	Q. 20	9.0	4.0	5.0
Organization of Material				
	Q. 44	11.0	29.5	8.0
	Q. 35	1.0	1.0	1.0
Presentation of Material				
	Q. 10	7.0	7.0	10.0
	Q. 17	16.5	20.0	19.0
Attitude towards teaching				
	Q. 16	41.0	45.0	36.0
	Q. 48	7.0	8.0	9.0
Research for Creative Scholarship				
Preparation(Academic)				
	Q. 9	25.0	16.0	18.0
	Q. 4	29.0	24.0	22.0
Planning and execution				
	Q 24.	19.0	21.5	23.0
Results(Publication)				
	Q. 8	54.0	59.0	58.0
Direction of Graduate Students				
Professional Service				
Service with Students	Q. 30	58.0	58.0	59.0
Committee work(Dept. Coll.&Univ)	Q. 25	49.0	50.0	52.0
	Q. 37	59.0	56 .0	56.0
Off-campus Professional Work				

*See Manual, Explanation of Merit Rating System, New Mexico State University, Dated September 1, 1967

Notes on Table 3

1. The criteria used in the survey questionnaire are not the same as used in the Merit Rating at New Mexico State University. The criteria in the questionnaire that seem most related to the Merit Rating items are identified by the number of the question on the questionnaire for each item used in Merit Rating.
2. The criteria of "Direction of Graduate Study" and "Off-Campus Professional Work" on the Merit Rating Form are not listed on the questionnaire and hence appear blank in the ranking table.

TABLE 4

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY ADMINISTRATIVE, NON-ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY.

CRITERIA	ADMIN.	NON ADMIN
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	5.0	2.0
Motivating students to do their best	3.0	3.0
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	4.0	4.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	2.0	7.0
Treating students with respect	6.0	5.0
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	9.0	6.0
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	7.0	8.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	8.0	9.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	10.0	10.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion		
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability		
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.		
Sample Size	50	149

RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 4

Administrative faculty with non-administrative faculty	=0.928
Administrative faculty with all New Mexico State Univ.	=0.915
Non-administrative faculty with all New Mexico State Univ.	=0.974

COMMENTS ON TABLE 4A

The non-administrative faculty(i.e. teaching faculty) has a higher rank correlation coefficient with the New Mexico State University community than does the administrative faculty.

TABLE 5

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY WITH VARYING YEARS OF SERVICE AT NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY.

CRITERIA	YEARS OF SERVICE 1-10	>10-20	>20
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	2.0	4.0	2.5
Motivating students to do their best	3.0	2.5	5.5
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	4.0	2.5	9.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	5.0	8.5	5.5
Treating students with respect	7.0	5.5	11.0
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	6.0	8.5	12.5
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	8.0	10.0	8.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	9.0	5.5	10.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	12.0	7.0	5.5
Organizing the course in logical fashion	11.0	12.0	2.5
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	10.0	14.5	15.5
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.			
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by students	4.0	2.5	9.0
Setting high standards of achievement for students	16.0	13.0	5.5
Sample Size	111	52	27

COMMENTS ON TABLE 5

The criteria ranking by faculty varies as the years of service change . The consistent changes are that the importance of "using teaching methods which enable students to achieve objective of the course" is less important to the older groups. Also, the importance of "constructive tests and "setting high standards" increases with years of service.(Generation gap?)

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 5

Faculty with 1-10 years of service and all N.M.S.U. =0.969

Faculty with 10-20 years of service and all N.M.S.U. =0.959

Faculty with more than 20 years of service and all N.M.S.U. =0.894

TABLE 6

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS OF VARYING G.P.A.

CRITERIA	GPA≤0-2	GPA>2-3	GPA > 3
Being well prepared for class	1.0	3.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	5.5	5.5	4.5
Motivating students to do their best			
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.			8.5
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	9.5	1.0	10.0
Treating students with respect	9.5		7.0
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve		7.0	8.5
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	2.0	2.0	6.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	7.0	4.0	4.5
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	8.0	8.5	2.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	5.5	10.0	3.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	4.0	8.5	
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	3.0	5.5	
Sample Size	42	120	115

NOTES ON TABLE 6

1. Only the criteria ranked as top ten by each group of faculty, students, and alumni are shown in Table 6. The blanks can be filled in by the interested reader by referring to Tables 1 and 2.

   This method has been adopted(in this tables and some other tables that follow)in an attempt not to clutter the table with less important rankings.

TABLE 6A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 6

Student with 0-2 GPA and all N.M.S.U. =0.927

Student with > 2-3 GPA and all N.M.S.U. =0.960

Student with ≥3 GPA and all N.M.S.U. =0.981

TABLE 7

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING FOR VARIOUS "TYPES" OF STUDENTS

CRITERIA	Live in Dorm	Commuter	Original at NMSU	Transfer
Being well prepared for class	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	3.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
Motivating students to do their best				
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	10.5	10.0		10.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	7.0	6.5	8.0	2.0
Treating students with respect	8.0			9.0
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve		8.0	10.0	8.0
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	4.0	6.5	4.0	4.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	9.0	3.0	5.0	6.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	10.5	9.0	8.0	
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	6.0		8.0	
Sample Size	86	194	162	117

COMMENTS ON TABLE 7

"Motivating students to do their best" was ranked third by all faculty but is not ranked in the top ten by any student group(those who live in dorms, are commuters, are registered originally at New Mexico State University, or those who transferred to New Mexico State University.)

TABLE 7A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 7

Commuter student with dormitory student	=0.960
Student starting at N.M.S.U. with transfer student	=0.948

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY IN EACH COLLEGE.

CRITERIA	Colleges				
	A&S	A&HE	BA&E	EDUC	ENGR
Seldom using sarcasm with students				6.5	
Rewriting and updating tests					7.0
Raising the aspirational level of students					10.0
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.0	1.0	6.5	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in subj. taught	3.0	3.0	5.5	6.5	2.5
Motivating students to do their best	4.0	2.0	5.5	1.0	5.0
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	2.0	6.5		4.0	10.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	5.0	6.5		2.5	7.0
Treating students with respect	9.0	5.0	2.5	9.5	2.5
Using teaching methods which enable stud. to achieve objectives of the course	6.5	4.0	5.5		
Being fair and reasonable to stud. in evaluation procedures	11.5	8.5	2.5	6.5	4.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	8.0			2.5	
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability.	6.5		9.5	9.5	
Organizing the course in logical fashion		8.5	5.5		7.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability.		10.0			
Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter.					10.0
Identifying his comments which are personal opinion			9.5		
Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom			9.5		
Setting high standards of achievement for stud.			9.5		
Sample Size	88	38	7	17	26

COMMENTS ON TABLE 8

All faculty subgroups in the colleges, except the College of Education, ranked the criterion "being well prepared for class" as the most important criterion. The faculty in the College of Education ranked this criterion as 6.5 and ranked "motivating students to do their best" as the most important criterion.

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 8

Faculty in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. =0.949

Faculty in College of Agric. & Home Econ. with all N.M.S.U. =0.936

Faculty in College of Bus. Admin. & Econ. with all N.M.S.U. =0.810

Faculty in College of Education with all N.M.S.U. =0.833

Faculty in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. =0.910

TABLE 9

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP PRIORITY CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS IN DIFFERENT COLLEGES.

CRITERIA	A&S	A&HE	BA&E	EDUC	ENGR	GRAD
Being well prepared for class	1.0	4.0	7.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in subj. taught	5.5	3.0	1.5	9.0	9.0	4.0
Motivating students to do their best			15.0	4.0		4.0
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	5.5	7.5			12.0	10.5
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate.	9.5	5.0	9.0	3.0	7.0	8.0
Treating students with respect		6.0	10.5	2.0		2.0
Using teaching methods which enable stud. to achieve objectives of the course			7.0		6.0	10.5
Being fair and reasonable to stud. in evaluation procedures	2.0	1.0	3.5	6.0	2.0	7.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	3.0	7.5	5.0	7.0	4.5	9.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability.	4.0	13.0	3.5	5.0	8.0	4.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	8.0		1.5	9.0	3.0	6.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability.	7.0	10.0	10.5	9.0	10.0	
Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter.	9.5	2.0	7.0		4.5	
Identifying his comments which are personal opinion						
Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom						
Setting high standards of achievement for stud.						
Rewriting and updating tests		9.0				
Sample Size	50	38	48	37	57	52

TABLE 9A

SELECTED* RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 9

Students in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.971
Students in College of Ag. & Home Econ. with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.948
Students in College of Bus. Admin. & Econ. with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.935
Students in College of Education with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.931
Students in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.934
Students in Graduate School with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.951

*Rank correlations between the students of the different colleges and other subgroups in the university have not been shown because of space limitations. All correlation coefficients are available to those interested.

TABLE 10

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY ALUMNI FOR EACH COLLEGE.

CRITERIA	A&S	A&HE	BA&E	EDUC	ENGR	GRAD
Patiently assisting stud. with their problems				9.5		
Being readily available for consultation with students		9.0				
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in subj. taught	2.0	1.5	2.5	7.0	7.5	5.0
Motivating students to do their best		7.5				3.0
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	3.5	7.5	7.0	9.5	7.5	3.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	8.0			3.0	10.5	9.5
Treating students with respect	5.5	4.5	9.5	6.0		
Using teaching methods which enable stud. to achieve objectives of the course			9.5	3.0	10.5	6.0
Being fair and reasonable to stud. in evaluation procedures	8.0	4.5	4.5	9.5	5.5	9.5
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	5.5		4.5	3.0	2.0	8.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability.	3.5	4.5		5.0	3.0	3.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	8.0		7.0		5.5	7.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability.	10.0			9.5	9.0	
Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter.		4.5	2.5		4.0	
Identifying his comments which are personal opinion						
Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom						
Setting high standards of achievement for stud.						
Rewriting and updating tests			7.0			
Sample Size	39	23	15	22	58	27

TABLE 10A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 10

Alumni from College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.951
Alumni from College of Ag. & Home Econ. with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.907
Alumni from College of Bus. Admin. & Econ. with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.935
Alumni from College of Education with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.946
Alumni from College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.961
Alumni from Graduate School with all N.M.S.U.	= 0.942

TABLE 11

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS AND ALUMNI IN COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES.

CRITERIA	Faculty	Students	Alumni
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	3.0	5.5	2.0
Motivating students to do their best	4.0	13.5	11.0
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	2.0	5.5	3.5
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	5.0	9.5	8.0
Treating students with respect	9.0	12.0	5.5
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	6.5	11.0	16.5
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	11.5	2.0	8.0
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	8.0	3.0	5.5
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	6.5	4.0	3.5
Organizing the course in logical fashion	11.5	8.0	8.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	10.0	7.0	10.0
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.			
Sample Size	88	50	39

TABLE 11A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 11

Faculty in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. = 0.949

Students in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. = 0.971

Alumni in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. = 0.951

TABLE 12

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI IN THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & HOME ECONOMICS.

CRITERIA	FACULTY	STUDENTS	ALUMNI
Being well prepared for class	1.0	4.0	1.5
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	3.0	3.0	1.5
Motivating students to do their best	2.0	18.5	7.5
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	6.5	7.5	7.5
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	6.5	5.0	15.0
Treating students with respect	5.0	6.0	4.5
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	4.0	11.5	12.0
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	8.5	1.0	4.5
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	12.0	7.5	20.5
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	18.0	13.0	4.5
Organizing the course in logical fashion	8.5	11.5	12.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	18.0	10.0	29.0
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	15.5	2.0	4.5
Rewriting and updating tests	12.0	9.0	20.5
Being readily available for consultation with students	12.0	15.0	9.0
Sample Size	38	38	23

TABLE 12A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS WITH ALL N.M.S.U. AND SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 12

Faculty in College of Agriculture & Home Economics =0.936

Students in College of Agriculture & Home Economics =0.948

Alumni in College of Agriculture & Home Economics =0.907

TABLE 13

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI IN THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & ECONOMICS.

CRITERIA	FACULTY	STUDENT	ALUMNI
Being well prepared for class	1.0	7.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	5.5	1.5	2.5
Motivating students to do their best	5.5	15.0	15.5
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	15.0	12.0	7.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	15.0	9.0	15.5
Treating students with respect	2.5	10.5	9.5
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	5.5	7.0	9.5
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	2.5	3.5	4.5
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	15.0	5.0	4.5
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	9.5	3.5	11.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	5.5	1.5	7.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	24.5	10.5	18.0
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	20.5	7.0	2.5
Rewriting and updating tests	15.0	18.0	7.0
Sample Size	7	48	15

TABLE 13A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR ALL N.M.S.U. AND SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 13

Faculty in College of Business Administration & Economics	=0.810
Students in College of Business Administration & Economics	=0.935
Alumni in College of Business Administration & Economics	=0.935

TABLE 14

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI IN THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION.

CRITERIA	FACULTY	STUDENTS	ALUMNI
Being well prepared for class	6.5	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	6.5	9.0	7.0
Motivating students to do their best	1.0	4.0	12.5
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	4.0	13.5	9.5
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	2.5	3.0	3.0
Treating students with respect	9.5	2.0	6.0
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	11.5	11.5	3.0
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	6.5	6.0	9.5
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	2.5	7.0	3.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	9.5	5.0	5.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	26.5	9.0	15.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	26.5	9.0	9.5
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	26.5	13.5	20.0
Rewriting and updating tests	17.0	17.0	15.0
Patiently assisting stud. with their problems	33.5	18.0	9.5
Seldom using sarcasm with students	6.5	29.0	47.0
Sample Size	17	37	22

TABLE 14A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS WITH ALL N.M.S.U. AND SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 14

Faculty in College of Education with all N.M.S.U.	=0.833
Students in College of Education with all N.M.S.U.	=0.931
Alumni in College of Education with all N.M.S.U.	=0.940

TABLE 15

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI IN THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING.

CRITERIA	FACULTY	STUDENTS	ALUMNI
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	2.5	9.0	7.5
Motivating students to do their best	5.0	20.0	12.5
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	10.0	12.0	7.5
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	7.0	7.0	10.5
Treating students with respect	2.5	19.0	12.5
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	13.0	6.0	10.5
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	4.0	2.0	5.5
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	13.0	4.5	2.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	15.0	8.0	3.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	7.0	3.0	5.5
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	18.5	10.0	9.0
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	10.0	4.5	4.0
Rewriting and updating tests	7.0	11.0	14.0
Sample Size	26	57	58

TABLE 15A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 15

Faculty in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. = 0.910

Student in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. = 0.934

Alumni in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. = 0.961

TABLE 16

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS AND ALUMNI IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL.

CRITERIA	STUDENTS	ALUMNI
Being well prepared for class	1.0	1.0
Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught	4.0	5.0
Motivating students to do their best	4.0	3.0
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud.	10.5	3.0
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate	8.0	9.5
Treating students with respect	2.0	11.0
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve	10.5	6.0
Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures.	7.0	9.5
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj.	9.0	8.0
Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability	4.0	3.0
Organizing the course in logical fashion	6.0	7.0
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	12.0	15.0
Being able to show practical applications of subject matter.	16.0	20.5
Sample Size	52	27

TABLE 16A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 16

Students in Graduate College with all N.M.S.U. = 0.951

Alumni in Graduate College with all N.M.S.U. = 0.942

TABLE 16B

SUMMARY OF RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS DISPLAYED IN TABLES 8A, 9A, 10A, 11A, 12A, 13A, 14A, 15A, and 16A.(BETWEEN ALL N.M.S.U. AND VARIOUS SUBGROUPS IN COLLEGES) AND SAMPLE SIZES

GROUP	A&S	A&HE	BA&E	EDUC	ENGR	GRAD
FACULTY	0.949 (88)	0.936 (38)	0.810 (7)	0.833 (17)	0.910 (26)	
STUDENTS	0.971 (50)	0.948 (38)	0.935 (48)	0.931 (37)	0.934 (57)	0.951 (52)
ALUMNI	0.951 (39)	0.907 (23)	0.935 (15)	0.940 (22)	0.961 (58)	0.942 (27)

Note: Sample Size is shown in parenthesis.

COMMENTS ON TABLE 16B

1. Among the colleges, two groups in the College of Arts & Sciences (faculty and students)have the highest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University. The alumni of the College of Arts & Sciences has the second highest rank correlation coefficient among the colleges.(Engineering has the highest).
2. Amongst the faculty, the College of Business Administration and Economics has the lowest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University.
3. Amongst the students, the College of Education has the lowest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University.
4. Amongst the alumni, the College of Agriculture & Home Economics has the lowest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University.

TABLE 17

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING USED IN STUDENT EVALUATION* AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI

	FACULTY	STUDENT	ALUMNI
Teachers apparent familiarity with subject Q. 20	9.0	4.0	5.0
Teachers ability to convey his know. of sub Q. 10	5.0	7.0	10.0
Teachers ability to stimulate interest Q. 6	3.0	13.0	11.0
Teachers apparent attitude toward subject Q.27	2.0	3.0	2.0
Teachers apparent attitude towards stud.			
Q. 18	34.0	57.0	39.0
Q. 33	18.0	40.0	17.0
Q. 39	16.5	14.0	14.0
Q. 41	6.0	11.0	7.0
Teachers impartiality in grading Q. 55	8.0	2.0	6.0
Annoying mannerisms in the teacher Q. 26	52.0	54.0	54.0
Organization of the course Q. 44	11.0	5.5	8.0

* See appendix B. for copy of Student Evaluation Sheet most often used at N.M.S.U.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There is considerable variation among the ranking of the criteria of effective teaching by faculty, students, and alumni at New Mexico State University. There is, however, unanimity amongst all three groups that the most important criterion is "being well prepared for class." This ranking was upheld by the ten subgroups of faculty (faculty by years of service, teaching or administrative, and faculty by colleges) except for the faculty of the College of Education. The faculty in the College of Education ranked "motivating students to do their best" as the most important criterion.

A criterion concerning research, that of "publishing material related to his suject field" was ranked low by the three groups. Faculty ranked this criterion as 54, students as 59, and alumni as the 58 most important criterion. Another research related criterion, "being consistently involved in research projects," was ranked 56, 55, and 57 by faculty, students, and alumni. These rankings clearly means that the N.M.S.U. community feels that publishing in one's field and being involved in research projects is <u>not</u> important for effective teaching. Criteria concerned with off-campus community relations were also ranked low by all three groups of faculty, students, and alumni. The criterion of "being knowledgeable about the community in which he lives" was ranked as 57,53, and 53 by faculty, students, and alumni respectively. The criterion of "making appearances which assist programs of community organizations," was ranked unanimously as being <u>least</u> important by each group of faculty, staff, and students.

The criteria used in faculty merit rating were compared with the criteria used in the study questionnaire. No criterion was worded

identically, but there were many criteria in the questionnaire that were related to those used in faculty merit rating. The ranking of these criteria(Table 3) indicate that there are four criteria ranked in the top ten by the N.M.S.U. community that do not appear explicitly in the Merit Rating Form(questions 2, 27, 4, and 55 on the questionnaire). On the other hand, four criteria listed in the bottom ten by the N.M.S.U. community do appear on the Merit Rating Form(questions 8, 19, 30, and 37). This suggests that the Merit Rating criteria used for evaluating effective teaching should be redesigned assuming that it is used for evaluating effective teaching. The quesionnaire study can help in such a redesign and also in assigning weights to each of the criteria used for merit rating.

The ranking of criteria by the administrative faculty was different from the rankings by the teaching faculty(see Table 4). This implies that teaching faculty are being evaluated(by administrative faculty) according to a ranking scale different from their own. This implication may be important when one considers that the ranking of the teaching faculty has a higher rank order correlation coefficient with the N.M.S.U. community than does the administrative faculty.(See Table 4)

The ranking by subgroups of faculty by years of service, and by subgroups of students do indicate some interesting results but no important pattern emerges. The ranking by subgroups of faculty, students, and alumni within colleges identify some interesting and significant divergencies between colleges and could be of interest for discussions by college faculties.

Comparing the questionnaire criteria with the criteria used on the most commonly used student evaluation form at N.M.S.U., it appears that many of the criteria ranked high by the N.M.S.U. community and

the students themselves do not appear on the Student Evaluation Form. Of the top ten criteria as ranked by students in the survey, five do not appear on the Student Evaluation Form. Of the top ten criteria as ranked by faculty, four do not appear on the Student Evaluation Form. This implies that if the Student Evaluation Form is to reflect the ranking priorities of the students for the faculty(whom it is allegedly designed to help) then the present Student Evaluation Form should be redesigned.

In conclusion, it should be stated that this study does identify attitudes concerning teaching effectiveness. It should provide a basis of discussion which should lead to a design of an instrument that would better identify the variables involved. If this instrument is a questionnaire, then an attempt should be made to take a larger sample and use techniques of factor analysis and discriminant analysis in analysing the results.

Meanwhile, as suggested above, it is hoped that this study would provide a basis of discussion between groups in administration, among faculty, and between the faculty and the administration. The topic of criteria of effective teaching could well be the subject of a one or two day seminar in which resource speakers are followed by group discussions between the teaching faculty and the administration. This dialogue could be useful not only in better articulating the criteria, their significance and how they could be achieved, but it would also improve the communication between faculty and administration. Such a seminar could not only help teaching faculty at N.M.S.U. to be more effective teachers, but could also lead to more equitable and satisfactory procedures of faculty evaluation. A recent study at N.M.S.U. showed that only 57% of the faculty at N.M.S.U. considered the ability of their dean to "evaluate faculty

performance fairly" as being adequate or excellent. Only 46% stated that their dean "lets you know your standing in relation to how your work is evaluated" as adequate or excellent.* This percentage could perhaps be increased by a seminar or some similar discussion. This in turn would lead to a better communication on our organizational goals concerning teaching and a better understanding of the means of achieving them. The seminar could also include student representatives, thereby, improving the communication between students and

*See Peterson, B.O., A Study of Faculty Attitudes at Two State Supported Universities.
(Doctoral dissertation at N.M.S.U., 1968)

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study for New Mexico State University arose out of a discussion at a professional meeting with Dr. Perry, Director of Institutional Studies, University of Toledo. He kindly paid for the printing of the questionnaire and provided all the computational resources needed. His help and cooperation throughout this study is greatly appreciated.

Dr. McKean, Director of the Statistical Laboratory at New Mexico State University kindly helped in the statistical interpretation of the data.

Miss Celina Chavez typed all draft and final copies. The authors want to express their appreciation for her cheerful assistance.

FOR STUDENTS ONLY

Please respond to each item:

(1) 1. Indicate your college:
☐ ABS, ☐ Bus.Ad. & Economics,
☐ Educ., ☐ Engr., ☐ Grad. School
☐ Ag. - E. E.

(2) 2. Indicate your class rank:
☐ Freshman, ☐ Sophomore,
☐ Junior, ☐ Senior, ☐ Graduate

(3) (4) 3. Indicate your Term Average:
☐ B&UE, ☐ UEOE, ☐ EEOE,
☐ OEOE

(5) 4. Indicate whether you:
☐ live at home and commute to the University, ☐ live in a University Dormitory, ☐ live in other housing and commute to the University.

(6) 5. Indicate your Sex:
☐ Male, ☐ Female
CHECK ONLY ONE.

(7) 6. Has Kansas State University been the first college / university _____
I entered Kan Kansas State University as a Transfer Student_____

FOR ALUMNI ONLY

Please respond to each item:

(1) 1. Indicate the college from which you graduated:
☐ ABS, ☐ Bus.Ad. & Economics,
☐ Educ., ☐ Engr., ☐ Grad. School
☐ Ag. - B. S.

(2) 2. Indicate your highest earned degree at the distinct from University: ☐ Assoc. Certificate,
☐ Bachelors, ☐ Masters,
☐ Doctorate

(3) 3. Did you graduate with Honors?
☐ Yes, ☐ No

(4) 4. Indicate your Sex:
☐ Male, ☐ Female

(5) (6) 5. How many years has it been since you received your first degree? ☐ 1-5, ☐ 6-10, ☐ 11-15,
☐ 16-20, ☐ 21-25, ☐ 25-30,
☐ 30-35, ☐ 35+

These responses provide for some of the variables in the study.

FOR FACULTY ONLY

Please respond to each item:

(1) 1. Indicate your college:
☐ ABS, ☐ Bus.Ad. & Economics,
☐ Educ., ☐ Engr., ☐ Grad. School
☐ Ag. - E. E.

(2) 2. Indicate your faculty rank:
☐ Instructor, ☐ Asst. Prof.,
☐ Assoc. Prof., ☐ Professor

(3) 3. Indicate your administrative position held at the University:
☐ Dept. Chairman, ☐ Asst. Dean,
☐ Assoc. Dean, ☐ Director,
☐ Dean or higher

(4) (5) 4. Indicate your total years of teaching experience at higher education: ☐ 1-5, ☐ 6-10, ☐ 11-15,
☐ 16-20, ☐ 21+

(5) (6) 5. Indicate your years of teaching experience at Kansas State University: ☐ 1-5, ☐ 6-10, ☐ 11-15,
☐ 16-20, ☐ 21+

(6) 6. Indicate your Sex:
☐ Male, ☐ Female

(7) 7. My university appointment is
☐ Full-time, ☐ Part-time

BEHAVIOR CRITERIA

CHECK ✓ YOUR JUDGMENT OF DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE

Evaluation of effective teacher behavior in higher education is important to the degree indicated in terms of the teacher:						
1. Evidencing better than average speech qualities						
2. Constructing tests which search for understanding on the part of the students rather than rote memory ability						
3. Providing several test opportunities for students						
4. Engaging in continual formal study in his field						
5. Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability						
6. Motivating students to do their best						
7. Explaining grading standards						
8. Presenting material related to his subject field						
9. Having practical experience in his field						
10. Communicating effectively at levels appropriate to the presentations of students						
11. Identifying his comments which are personal opinion						
12. Challenging students' convictions						
13. Utilizing visual aids to assist in creating subject matter achievement with students						
14. Announcing tests and quizzes in advance						
15. Making written comments on corrected returned assignments						
16. Presenting approved supplementary course material to students						
17. Celebrating good rapport with students in the classroom						
18. Making an effort to know students as individuals						
19. Inspiring students to continue for graduate study						
20. Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subject						
21. Exhibiting an intelligent personal philosophy of life						
22. Encouraging student participation in class						
23. Beginning and ending classes on time						
24. Accepting justified constructive criticism by audited persons						
25. Sharing departmental duties with his colleagues						
26. Having irritating personal mannerisms						
27. Coordinating efforts interest in the subject being taught						
28. Taking measures to prevent cheating by students						
29. Recognizing his responsibility for the academic success of students						
30. Devoting time to student activities on campus						
31. Demonstrating a stable well-heeled personality						
32. Returning graded assignments promptly						
33. Patiently assisting students with their problems						
34. Holding membership in scholarly organizations						
35. Being well prepared for class						
36. Setting high standards of achievement for students						
37. Involving himself in appropriate university committees						
38. Being knowledgeable about the community in which he lives						
39. Being readily available for consultation with students						
40. Displaying broad intellectual interests						
41. Treating students with respect						
42. Raising the aspirational level of students						
43. Being able to show practical applications of subject matter						
44. Organizing the course in logical fashion						
45. Making appearances which assist programs of community organizations						
46. Earning the respect of his colleagues						
47. Encouraging intelligent independent thought by students						
48. Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve objectives of the course						
49. Reporting and updating tests						
50. Presenting an extensive test syllabus of the course to students						
51. Explaining grading procedures						
52. Being consistently involved in research projects						
53. Seldom using sarcasm with students						
54. Indicating that the scope and demands of each assignment have been considered carefully						
55. Being fair and reasonable to students in evaluation procedures						
56. Relating course material to that of other courses						
57. Using more than one type of evaluation device						
58. Being neatly dressed						
59. Exhibiting a genuine sense of humor						
60. Encouraging moral responsibility in students by his example						

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

STUDENT EVALUATION CHART

Course number_____ Course title_____

Semester taken_____ Name of instructor_____

You are asked, by means of this form, to help your instructor improve the course when he offers it again. Both praise and negative criticism are in order. Do not hesitate to give your honest opinion. Please do not sign this form.

PART I. (Check only one item on each line.)

1. Teacher's apparent familiarity with subject.	Extensive	Average	Limited
2. Teacher's ability to convey his knowledge about subject.	Above Average	Average	Below Average
3. Teacher's ability to stimulate interest in the subject.	Above Average	Average	Below Average
4. Teacher's apparent attitude toward the subject.	Enthusiastic	Average	Bored
5. Teacher's apparent attitude toward the students	Sympathetic	Average	Unsympathetic
6. Teacher's impartiality in grading	Fair	Average	Biased
*7. Annoying mannerisms in the teacher.	Seldom Exhibits	Average	Often Exhibits
8. Organization of the course	Excellent	Average	Poor

* **Please list annoying mannerisms if present:**_____

PART II. In a few words, answer each of the following questions as objectively as you can.

1. How could the instructor improve his presentation of the course material?

2. What is the instructor's greatest weakness as a teacher of this course?

3. What is the instructor's greatest contribution to the course?

CONTRAST THE TEACHING OF THIS COURSE WITH THE TEACHING OF THE OTHER COURSES YOU ARE TAKING THIS SEMESTER

Superior	Average	Inferior

Remarks:_____